



## ***Land Use and Zoning Meeting Minutes***

*June 19, 2014*

STAFF:	David Radachy
DATE:	June 20, 2014

The Land Use and Zoning Committee hereby finds and determines that all formal actions were taken in an open meeting and that all deliberations of the Land Use and Zoning Committee, which resulted in formal action, were taken in a meeting open to the general public, in full compliance with applicable legal requirements of Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code.

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

Attendance was taken by sign-in sheet. The following members were present: Messrs. Constantine, Falcone, Klco, Morse, and Welch and Ms. Diak. Staff: David Radachy. Public: Mr. John Lateulere

Public Comment: Mr. Lateulere stated that he was not going to make any statements on the project, but he was available for questions if that was permissible. The Committee stated that would be fine.

Mr. Radachy stated that there was one case this evening from Concord Township.

### **Concord Township – District Amendment, 17.095 Acres THN to R-3**

Staff stated that the property that the zoning district change was being asked for is located on Concord Hambden Road in Concord Township. It was located south of I-90, west of Hammond Electronics, east of Ravenna Road and North of Concord Hambden Road. It is near Quail Hollow Subdivision. Staff noted that the double driveway in the bottom of the airphoto was the entrance to Quail Hollow.

Staff stated the property was 17.095 acres of land, 16.951 acres exclusive of the right-of-way. The maximum number of units that they could build on the site is 135 attached units (8 units per acre) or 101 detached units (6 units per acre.). Staff also mentioned that the lot slopes towards I-90. Its elevation drops fifty feet between Concord Hambden and I-90.

Staff stated that the land is currently zoned Townhall Neighborhood, THN. It was rezoned to this district in 2010. Staff stated that currently THN has commercial, office and retail uses as well as residential care facilities and hospice. Originally it was to have cluster residential uses, but Concord Township removed those uses. Staff stated that the 2004 Concord Township Comprehensive Plan recommended the 2010 change and it recommended this one.

The Committee asked about the possibility of a roundabout being installed at the intersection of Ravenna Road and Concord-Hambden Road. Staff stated that he does not remember hearing any plans for a roundabout at this location. He also stated that it took forever to make this intersection a four way stop and he did not believe that traffic would warrant a roundabout. But, that is something for the County Engineer and ODOT to decide.

Staff went over the land use of the parcels being requested to be changed, which was vacant. They also stated that the adjacent properties were single family and I-90 to the north, vacant, single family, retail (the nursery) at the southwest corner of Concord-Hambden and Ravenna Roads, and multi-family in Quail Hollow to the south. Single Family and a church is to the East and office and industrial to the west.

Staff stated that the Comprehensive Plan recommends zoning that supports the Township Center Concept. The plan states: Consider **creating a new Town Center/Mixed-Use District** in the area of the Town Hall to achieve the Town Center concept. The new district would support existing community facilities at this location and create a more pedestrian-oriented area that would be developed at a scale comparable to the adjacent area. Specific recommendations for this area include attached single family units.

Staff stated that the purpose statement of the R-3 Multi-Family District is established to provide for a limited amount of alternative housing types to the traditional detached single-family dwellings in the Township. It is the intent of this district to allow for both multi-family and single detached cluster dwellings in locations that meet the following criteria in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan:

- As a transitional land use between lower-density single-family residential areas (areas currently zoned R-1 Residential) and non-residential areas;
- In areas adjacent to major highways such as Interstate 90; and
- In locations that are currently zoned for single-family residential (areas currently zoned R-1 Residential) where low-density residential is not likely to develop because of locational or site conditions.

This site meets two of the three conditions. It does not meet the third condition because it was never zoned R-1. It was previously M before it became THN. Neither one of those districts allow single family units, but this site would be very difficult to develop as single family, so it meets a part of that condition.

It is further intended that such districts be located so as to minimize their impacts on existing low density residential developments through the regulation of size, location and density of units and the application of appropriate landscaping and buffer areas, with adequate public services available to support the density. (All 7/18/2008)

Staff stated the R-3, Multi-Family has density of 8 units per acre for attached units, which are 3 to 8 units attached. They also stated that the R-3 also allows for cluster homes at a density of 6 units per acre. Staff stated that they reviewed the lots for zoning conformity and determined that 8A-14-12 does not meet the minimum standards for a development lot in R-3, it only has 182 feet of frontage and it needs 200 feet. But this could be fixed by combining the lot with 8A-14-39.

Staff stated that this is not a senior housing community. The community is being marketed to anyone who wants the feel of single family home without owning it and taking care of a yard. The packet that was mailed to you states that they are going after all age groups including empty nesters (older folks)

and the Millennials. Staff stated the rental application for other Redwood Properties has a minimum age of 21 years old in order to apply for an apartment. If the developer wishes to create a senior housing community, they can or would have use an R-5 Senior Residential Community district.

Once the district is changed, all permitted uses can be installed on the site. In this case, they would be restricted to attached single family and cluster homes.

Adjacent parcel 8A-14-11 may have some issues in the future in regards to rear and side setbacks. If the property is rezoned to R-3, 8A-14-11 may be required to provide a 50 foot rear and sideline clearance. This is a 30-foot increase. It does not make the lot unbuildable, just more difficult to build on. Staff also noted that there is a ten foot section of 8A-14-12 that goes between 8A-12-11 and 8A-12-10, the church. Changing the zoning of that section of the lot may cause a hardship on the other two lots because they would be required to provide a larger setback to R-3.

Staff recommended the district amendment because it is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, which calls for attached single family units to support the Town Hall Area. The zoning resolution does not allow for multi-family in the THN or THC, so a change to R-3 is the only option for adding attached single family. This change would provide a buffer between the single family uses on Ravenna Road and industrial and offices to the west. Staff also recommended that the ten-foot section of 8A-14-12 between 8A-14-11 and 8A-14-10 remain THN. This would keep the setback on 8A-14-11 at 20 feet instead of increasing to 50 feet.

Committee asked Mr. Lateulere why there was not a site plan included. Mr. Lateulere stated that a site plan was not required for rezoning and if they did submit one, they would not be required to build per that site plan. So they decided not to submit one. The Committee asked how many units, he stated 88. Staff stated they could get 135 at maximum density. The Committee asked if there were going to be sidewalks; the one that was submitted in Painesville Township did not have sidewalks. Mr. Lateulere stated no. It would be too difficult to install sidewalks because of FHA and ADA requirements and the topography of the site.

Mr. Morse made a motion to accept staff recommendation to recommend approval of the district amendment.

Mr. Klco seconded the motion.

All voted "Aye".

Motion passed.

Staff stated there was no new business and no old business.  
There was no public comment.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 PM.